HUMAN EVENTS

Vol. XVII, No. 8 Thursday, February 25, 1960 Washington, D. C.

THE LIBRARY
WISCONSIN STATE COLLEGE
RIVER FALLS, WISCONSIN

News Section

REUTHER: *Shown up by GOP* ..... (page 1)

WORLD COURT: *Repealer checked* ..... (page 2)

KEFAUVER: *Helped by bureaucrats* ..... (page 2)

US AID: *Sending the wrong kind* ..... (page 3)

TRUJILLO: *Defended by Smathers* ..... (page 4)

Reuther Unmasked: Senator Barry Goldwater (R.-Ariz.) has blown the lid off the big role and powerful influence Walter Reuther has in politics and the "pattern of violence" he imposes on industrial disputes. Goldwater and three other GOP members of the Senate Rackets Committee have made public a report charging that while the McClellan committee did a good job exposing some racketeers (Hoffa, etc.) in labor, it failed to investigate properly the activities of the Reuther union (United Auto Workers).

Goldwater and his colleagues [Curtis (Neb.), Mundt (S.D.) and Capehart (Ind.)] placed the responsibility for this failure on the doorstep of the Committee's Chief Counsel Robert Kennedy—significantly the brother of Senator and Presidential hopeful John F. Kennedy.

For several years, numerous reports have suggested that the strategy of the Rackets Committee—under Bob Kennedy's guidance—has been to place the onus on the Teamsters (Hoffa) and old-line AFL unions for the "labor mess" and to steer the muck-raking of labor union activities away from Reuther and the CIO unions.

If this was the strategy, it was to the advantage of Senator Kennedy, because stern handling of the politically powerful Reuther, with his control of about one-third of the delegates to the Democratic Presidential nominating convention, might prove dangerous to a Democratic candidate. Senator Kennedy wants to be the Democratic nominee.

Capital observers find it further significant that Robert Kennedy, in a new book (*The Enemy Within*) on the labor probe, attacks Goldwater and his colleagues for trying to "get" Reuther. Robert Kennedy also praises his brother in the book and adds that Senator Jack "will make a great President."

The Republican report by Goldwater and his colleagues has stirred up Capitol Hill as have few such documents in many years. Southern Democrats, presently engaged in a battle over civil rights bills, noted that the Goldwater report said: "It is ironic and incongruous that liberals of America have applauded when a battalion of paratroopers was dispatched to guarantee the rights of a racial minority to desegregated education in one state, while the same group has stood idly by when entire communities have been intimidated, terrorized and deprived of civil rights to which they are entitled under law. The American people have a right to know why."

The GOP report charges "a clear pattern of crime and violence" by the Reuther labor union power, marked by "imported professional hoodlums who, through mass picketing, terroristic tactics, personal threats and intimidation" sought to win such strikes as those against Kohler in Wisconsin and the Perfect Circle Company in Indiana.

Other bombshells the Goldwater Republican report exploded were:

(1) *The failure of the Rackets Committee to properly go into the records of Reuther and his UAW, despite the fact that "US Treasury agents filed a* $3,250,000 *income tax claim against Walter Reuther, Emil Mazey and other officials of the UAW, for expense money paid out with no accounting required by the union during the years* 1955-57. *The case was quietly settled in October,* 1959, *for* $106,000."

(2) Goldwater and his colleagues said they are "unalterably convinced, based on the information obtained during the investigation of Richard T. Gosser, Senior Vice President of the UAW and second in power only to Walter Reuther himself, that corruption, misappropriation of funds, bribery, extortion and collusion with the underworld have existed within the UAW as in the Teamsters and those other unions whose derelictions have been so widely publicized."

(3) The Republican report emphasizes the "pattern of violence" marking UAW drives to close struck plants. Bringing this theme down to very recent occurrences, the report says that the UAW sent one of its key men with $25,000 to Albert Lea, Minnesota, where the United Packinghouse Workers union was seeking to close the Wilson Co. plant. The "usual violent pattern characteristic of the UAW" followed and the plant was closed.

(4) "At the Kohler strike, for instance, acid was thrown on the Holy Bible and the American flag."

As for Reuther's political power, the GOP report recommends Federal legislation to outlaw the expenditure of union funds, manpower and facilities for political purposes. This demand gains momentum on Capitol Hill as Earl Mazo (biographer of Nixon and ace reporter of the New York *Herald Tribune*) reports that "Walter Reuther has confided to intimates that his powerful organization favors either Humphrey or Kennedy, and probably will narrow the choice to the Wisconsin primary winner."

Published weekly at 408 First Street, S.E., Washington 3, D. C. • Copyright 1960 by HUMAN EVENTS

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

World Court: Several prominent long-time internationalists lined up last week against the current crusade to subordinate American sovereignty to foreign power—by means of a proposal by Senator Hubert Humphrey to repeal the Connally Reservation of 1946. This amendment (to US acceptance of World Court jurisdiction) reserved for the US the right to determine when a legal dispute with another nation should be subject to the court's rulings.

None other than former Senator Tom Connally filed a strong letter of protest last Wednesday with the Senate Foreign Relations Committee against the attempt to abolish his reservation. Connally, as Chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee (1941-47, 1949-53), was noted as a strong supporter of internationalist policies under both Roosevelt and Truman.

But the one-time wheelhorse for one-worldism voiced his "deep regrets that a matter of such serious importance is being treated as a propaganda device in an attempt to win an international popularity contest." He expressed fear that without his reservation, the World Court might try to rule on disputes involving immigration, tariffs and the Panama Canal.

At the Senate hearings last week, presided over by Senator Fulbright (a well-known Rhodes scholar), a group called the Ad Hoc Committee of Rhodes Scholars for Preservation of the Connally Reservation, headed by Alexander C. Dick, filed a protest against the repeal attempt. Rhodes Scholars traditionally have been in the forefront of internationalist movements.

Dick finds the international court a poor vehicle with which to settle important international disputes and misunderstandings.

It remained for an American nationalist, Clarence "Pat" Manion, former Dean of Notre Dame Law School, to debunk one of the propaganda products of the "World Court" zealots. Senator Humphrey's followers have claimed that the repeal of the Connally Reservation has been backed by the American Bar Association. Manion claimed it is "a gross misrepresentation" to attribute the "eccentric views" of a few internationalist lawyers to the ABA itself. The Bar's endorsement of the World Court in 1947, said Manion, has been officially repealed since then. Manion also challenged Vice President Nixon to come out and clarify his apparently "confused" statements about the repealer.

Fulbright, an ardent World Court backer, called off public hearings after receiving a flood of mail and listening to the above objectors (as well as some internationalist supporters). He and some colleagues agreed that the controversy might prove too controversial to send to the Senate floor for debate this election year. But others regard this as a "pigskin under the jersey" move and warn of the danger of a clever "repealer" blitz later in the session.

With the Candidates: *Kennedy* — As Midwestern sources see it, Jack Kennedy's Wisconsin primary strategy is to picture himself as an underdog campaigning in the other guy's backyard against the impassioned advice of his closest associates. Most observers think Kennedy will emerge with an edge—but not enough to count as a major victory.

Along with reports of the Massachusetts entrant's slick operation comes word that the Kennedys may have outsmarted themselves with many Wisconsin voters. The Senator's photogenic wife, Jacqueline, has impressed many as a "cafe society type" they would not like to see as First Lady. Homespun housewives of the Badger State remark that they disapprove of Jackie's smoking in public (even though many claim they don't mind the practice by women at private gatherings).

Johnson — Washington observers are watching the lonely and perilous civil rights trail Senator Lyndon Johnson is being forced to ride these days. It is conceded that Lyndon must bring home some civil rights bacon to the "liberals" or suffer the "deep South" brand many enemies would stick him with and which he has fought so hard to avoid. Johnson's strategy reportedly is to go to the convention with some 450 of the 761 votes needed to nominate. His plan is to add enough Northern, Western, and border states support to this initial complement to go over on a later ballot. Last week Lyndon's battle plan was threatened as Senator Richard Russell scored Johnson for the "lynching of orderly procedure in the Senate" because the Texan invited Senators to tack civil rights amendments onto a minor school district bill. Capital observers believe that, should Russell and a few other key Southerners sour on Lyndon, his hard-core support will crumble, leaving him by the Presidential wayside well before the convention convenes.

Symington — Word from California is that Stuart "Everybody's Second Choice" Symington ran first in a poll of the 74 Democratic state legislators, who were asked to pick the man they thought their party would nominate. Twenty-five liked Stu, with 19 picking Kennedy and 17 for Adlai Stevenson. Lyndon Johnson was the choice of four while none predicted a Humphrey victory, although two lawmakers thought ultra-"liberal" darkhorse Chester Bowles would win.

Monopoly: Senator Estes Kefauver (D.-Tenn.) and his anti-monopoly probes have gotten into hot water and, strangely enough, the Department of Justice (under a Republican Administration) and/or its over-zealous anti-trust bureaucrats seem to want to bail him out.

Recently, the Justice Department suit against all the major oil companies of the Nation, filed several years ago, was dismissed for lack of sufficient evidence, with some tart comments by Federal Judge Royce Savage (appointed by FDR in 1940). Reaction among many members of Congress was that the Attorney General should have recognized this originally and should not have wasted Government money (not to mention oil company money) in trying to prosecute an unfounded suit.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Senator Everett Dirksen (R.-Ill.), GOP Senate leader, said some severe things about the conduct of Kefauver's anti-monopoly subcommittee, which sparks the material of many such suits in hearings. Thus, until last week, Kefauver and the anti-trust zealots were in hot water.

The Anti-Trust Division of the Justice Department apparently finds it politically expedient just now to ask for and get an indictment of the five biggest makers of electrical goods (GE, Westinghouse, etc.), on charges of price fixing. Regardless of the merits of the charges, the indictment gives Kefauver and his wild-swinging anti-monopoly group another license to engage in fishing expeditions detrimental to the free enterprise system.

Rockefeller: Washington notes that the Empire State's Governor has in the last few days switched from pouting over "boss interference" regarding his candidacy. He now adopts a coy attitude regarding the nomination and many are convinced he will re-enter the Presidential dogfight after the New York legislature adjourns next month. Many recall that at the time of his December 26 "withdrawal" Rocky gave his legislative commitments as a major reason for pulling out. Now, observers reason, Nelson can resume barnstorming free of pressing state business and criticism that he is neglecting his duties.

The New York Post *asked last week: "Is Governor Rockefeller back in the Presidential race? His advisors say he never really got out, just withdrew temporarily. Now Rockefeller is giving new signs that he hasn't given up hope. He announced on a* [*February* 14] *TV show that as soon as the legislative session is over he will tour the country and discuss national and international issues."*

Observers believe Rockefeller's decision to "discuss national and international issues" is no come-lately decision. As reported in HUMAN EVENTS in past weeks (including an exclusive report in the February 4 issue regarding the supposedly "hush-hush" Rockefeller HQ at 10 Rockefeller Plaza), political analysts and speech writers have been working full steam preparing for the opening of Rocky's spring offensive.

Nelson is being prepped on foreign policy, labor, civil rights, "social equality," and economic growth questions. Already he has broken the ice with a recent speech before the national convention of the Association of School Administrators in Atlantic City. Rocky called for Federal aid to school construction, stating that the Federal Government must join in with the states in aiding local school systems.

With the passing last week of Nelson Rockefeller's press secretary, Richard L. Amper, the Governor promoted assistant secretary Robert L. McManus to fill the vacancy. Democrat McManus was a speech writer for former Democratic Governor Averell Harriman during the 1958 campaign against Rocky.

Foreign Aid: President Eisenhower called for a $4.1 billion foreign aid bill last week, $1 billion more than voted by Congress last year. Part of the increase, he insisted, is necessary to keep such countries as India from going Communist. But this old cliche is not likely to get the foreign aid appropriation passed in full, as even such "liberal" Democrats as Senators Fulbright and Douglas have viewed unfavorably the President's request.

Ike's pitch for massive foreign aid (as predicted by HUMAN EVENTS December 23, 1959) comes almost on the heels of his December trip to India, where he was warmly received by the usually cold Nehru, and hailed by the population as a "Prince of Peace."

But while Ike thinks massive economic aid will stem the tide of communism in India, the fact is that India's main threat is not poverty and disease, but the military aggression of Red China.

The Reds have already grabbed some 46,000 square miles of territory claimed by India since 1914, and which were never claimed by Chiang Kai-shek. They have built a military road through Indian territory, and have fought and killed Indians in the now disputed Northern and North-East frontiers.

Although Uncle Sam has dispensed some $2 billion to India since 1950, $137 million last year (excluding loans from the International Monetary Fund and the Export-Import Bank), it has not given one dollar—or rupee—for *military aid.* A member of the Indian Embassy informed HUMAN EVENTS that "India does not believe in military aid," and "wouldn't take any."

Also, while Ike claims Indians are not well off economically, India is actually better off than it has ever been. Last year it reaped a record 73 million tons of grain to feed its own people.

Professor P. T. Bauer has further pointed out (HUMAN EVENTS, December 23) that any economic aid to India may be detrimental, since it tends to use US largesse to socialize industry and to back uneconomic projects.

Jack Paar: Tons of newsprint have been covered with the story that a latrine ("water closet") joke scissored from the taped portion of a Jack Paar television show led the $3,500-a-week comedian to walk out, sobbing: "There must be easier ways to make a living."

But Capital observers, recalling Paar's petulant broadcast a few weeks ago (quoted below) defending Communist dictator Castro, are discussing another issue being overlooked by most of the press: what are the responsibilities of the network (NBC) for the political opinions of an emotional infant when it offers him as an entertainer to a nightly audience of 5,500,000?

It is being pointed out here that Paar has written and said nothing to suggest that he is an authority on world affairs, yet Paar—because he brings in $10 million a year in advertising—is allowed an audience greater than that being reached by any Presidential aspirant.

DONALD L. JACKSON, Member of Congress from California: "I never miss an issue of HUMAN EVENTS, and I find it most interesting and helpful to me in my capacity as a member of Congress . . . . I find it stimulating and well worthwhile on occasions."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Here are paragraphs about Cuba and Castro from Paar's telecast of a month ago:

" . . . This man Castro is beloved by these people and here is a history of four or five hundred years of poor little people with their kids living in dirt and now this man promises them something else . . . .

"I know, for I have been in his home and have met his son and know personally that here is a kind, gentle, and loving man who has first and only the interest of the Cuban people in his heart, and all the nasty things the papers have been saying about him are just not true. I do not understand how they can say these awful things and mislead the public when they are just not true . . . ."

Latin America: Senator George Smathers (D.-Fla.) has just come back from an extensive tour of the Caribbean, describing the Cuban Government of Fidel Castro as "Communist dominated."

Smathers, who heads a Senate subcommittee on Latin America, also said he preferred Trujillo's Dominican dictatorship to the Communist one of Castro. "If the Dominican Republic falls to a Communist-dominated Government like Cuba's," said Smathers, "Haiti will go, too. Then the whole Caribbean will be lost."

Trujillo is under investigation by the Organization of American States for supposed secret trials of its citizens, but, Smathers said, Trujillo had arrested only "leftist elements" who were plotting against him. He also was told the trials were "fair and the convicted conspirators will be allowed to appeal the judges' verdicts."

● The recent visit to Cuba by Anastas I. Mikoyan, who concluded a sugar-and-loan deal with Castro, came as a result of the Communist soft-sell slogan, the "Spirit of Camp David," columnist George Sokolsky charged in a recent radio broadcast.

He said the "spirit" gave the impression the Cold War was over and "gave the Russians the assurance that the time was ripe to make a strong push into Latin America. . . .

"The visit of Mikoyan to Cuba," Sokolsky said, "ought to open the eyes of the American people to the ugliness of the Castro regime. It is a Communist regime. Fidel Castro is a tool of a Communist revolution. He is building a Latin American Communist state 90 miles from Miami. The danger is great and while we face this situation the President and the State Department utter sweet nothings. The failure to meet Castro head-on is one of the most disgraceful situations in American history."

Water Pollution: President Eisenhower is expected to veto the $900 million Federal Water Pollution Control bill passed by Congress last week—and the President has good reason, say those who have studied the bill.

They point out that the bill might better be called the "Federal Aid for Sewage Disposal bill," for the money is actually spent to build sewage disposal plants. The rationale is that sewage treated in such plants does not pollute neighboring streams, but no controls were provided in the original act (passed in 1955) to ensure that towns with genuine pollution problems actually get the funds. Hence, in the words of Congressman Russell Mack (R.-Wash.), the money can be given to "towns and villages in the middle of deserts and arid regions that are great distances from any river, stream, creek or brook."

President Eisenhower, cognizant of this flaw, has steadily refused to appropriate the $50 million yearly authorized under the present law, and is strongly opposed to upping the kitty, as Congress wants to do, to $90 million each year for the next ten years. Instead, the President wants to turn the whole program back to the states in the 1960-61 fiscal year.

A number of interstate compacts have already been signed, in which states on the same river solve any pollution problems by themselves, without Federal aid or interference.

The President was supported during debate by Senators Everett Dirksen (R.-Ill.) and Frank Lausche (D.-Ohio). Dirksen told the Senate, "No community will build a sewage treatment plant if it thinks for a moment that Federal funds will be available . . . . These programs have a way of snowballing, and their costs have a way of growing into fantastically large sums. This program will not tail off, finally, at $90 million a year."

Education: Modern Republican Senator J. Glenn Beall of Maryland stepped out of character when he cast the first "nay" vote for the GOP on the recent $1.8 billion Federal Aid to Education bill passed by the Senate. (Beall was an enthusiastic supporter of the National Defense Education Act adopted in 1958 and his voting record over the years has been dotted with endorsements of huge Federal spending projects in many fields.) Beall apparently is now learning the fiscal facts of life.

When the Maryland Senator made a close examination of the 1960 aid-to-education measure, he found that his own state would receive some $7 million (less handling charges) in benefits. But the joker in the deck, Beall discovered, was that in support of the total program Marylanders would be required to pay additional Federal taxes amounting to over $9 million.

● New Yorkers raise their eyebrows at the way one junior high school (John Barry) is educating the younger generation. Recently incorporated in its curriculum was a program whereby the students shine each other's shoes every morning in the classrooms.

The school's principal is elated over the project, saying: "While polished manners maketh the man, polished shoes maketh the gentleman."

"But," responded the *Wall Street Journal* last week, "we do wonder whether such subjects maketh for the best curriculum. What, for example, isn't being taught while the boys are busy teaching one another to shine shoes?"

TRIAL SUBSCRIPTIONS TO HUMAN EVENTS for new subscribers only: 5 weeks $1.
Yearly rate, $11; 6 months, $6; 3 months $3.
By first class mail, $13 a year; by airmail (including APO and FPO) $15 a year.
For change of address send old address (EXACTLY AS IT APPEARS on the envelope of your copy of HUMAN EVENTS) and new address (with zone number if any).
ALLOW US TWO WEEKS to process new subscriptions and change of address.
Bound Annual Volume with complete index, $15. Only 1955, 1956, 1958 and 1959 volumes available.

FRANK C. HANIGHEN, *Editor and Publisher* JAMES L. WICK, *Executive Publisher*
Assistant Editors: JOHN R. BENEDICT, NICHOLAS T. NONNENMACHER, GEORGE O. FOWLER
W. B. HICKS, JR., *Business Manager* FRANK CHODOROV, *Contributing Editor*

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Vol. XVII, No. 8 HUMAN EVENTS February 25, 1960

Article Section

Walter Lippmann: Complicated 'Clarifier'

LIBRARY
WISCONSIN STATE COLLEGE
RIVER FALLS, WISCONSIN

An Appraisal of a Top 'Liberal' Columnist

By SKEPTICUS

IN ITS ADVERTISING COPY for syndicated material the New York *Herald Tribune* describes Walter Lippmann, its political pundit of 28 years, as the "Clarifier." This is high praise for anybody who has attempted to express considered opinions on the confused issues of the past quarter century, but does it fit Walter Lippmann? Doubtless many readers feel that the Lippmann column clears up things for them; but, if there is one quality in other people that seems to annoy Walter Lippmann most, it is clarity.

Take a recent column in which W. L. discussed a press conference held by Secretary of State Christian Herter. Lippmann praised Herter on one count, and mildly rebuked him on another. The item which irked Lippman was the Secretary's statement that, inasmuch as the Russians insist on being recognized as leaders of the Communist world, their insistence "places upon the Russians a degree of responsibility for the actions of other members of the bloc." The reference was specifically to Red China.

This utterance, a fair piece of clarification by State Department standards, did not please Lippmann at all. He protested that, "as we have no relations with Peking and no influence in Peking, it is not seemly for us to issue official commentaries about Russian relations with Peking." Mr. Herter's criticism was, of course, aimed at the USSR, which we do recognize. In any event, what was wrong with letting the public in on the global nature of the Communist conspiracy?

In contrast to the clarity of Mr. Herter's statement on China was the muddiness of his replies to questions about Berlin. Plainly the Secretary was attempting to fend off the suspicion among the correspondents that some sort of jiggery pokery on Berlin had been agreed to at Camp David. The Secretary's responses became vaguer as the intent of the question became plainer. The Lippmann judgment on this phase of the conference was that "Mr. Herter did extremely well, most particularly with the question of Berlin."

Having praised Mr. Herter for vagueness, the Clarifier went off into some vagueness on his own account. He urged "negotiation" of a statute which will "be firm on the substance—on the security of West Berlin as a community—but flexible on the formulae of the guarantee and the arrangements." In short, firm about the language but "flexible" about making it stick.

Ordinarily it is unfair to judge a writer by what he wrote when his literary style was developing faster than his judgment or his information. But here we have a paradox; the works of the mature Lippmann often seem more immature than those of the jejeune Lippmann! It is more than a quarter of a century since Lippmann reached the sound conclusion that Franklin D. Roosevelt was "a pleasant man who, without any important qualifications for the office, would very much like to be President." It is some time back that he plumped for Alf Landon for President, and condemned "unconditional surrender" as a bad idea.

His two best books, *The Good Society* and *Public Opinion,* are more than a quarter century old. It is hard to believe that the Walter Lippmann of those days would have made any statement as uninformed as Lippmann's 1954 assertion that "our prestige in the world and our claim to be the leader and defender of free people have been hurt by McCarthy as they never were hurt by the world-wide apparatus of the Communist propaganda."

In Charles Beard's delightful little book *The Republic* one of the the characters supports what he has to say by referring to Walter Lippmann. His adversary confounds him by asking, "Which Walter Lippmann?" As is the case with less erudite people, there are several. There is the Scholar, riding high above the battle. There is also the controversialist, laying out his opponents with everything but the water bucket. Leaving aside McCarthy, one topic that arouses the polemic Lippmann is Formosa. On Feb. 8, 1955, after the evacuation of the Tachen islands by Chiang Kai-shek's troops, Lippmann declared: "The sound American policy would be to follow up what is being done in the Tachens by doing the same thing in Quemoy and Matsu . . . to evacuate them, not as the result of a bargain but as a strategic measure to liquidate a position of weakness and to fall

Published weekly at 408 First Street, S.E., Washington 3, D. C. • Copyright 1960 by HUMAN EVENTS

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

back on Formosa *which is a genuine position of strength.*" (Italics added.)

However, some three years later (September 11 1958) Formosa had changed from a "genuine position of strength" to a liability which we ought to liquidate as promptly as possible. Because we had based our policy on, among other things, "the untruth that the Red Chinese are planning to conquer Formosa [and] on the untruth that the offshore islands are related to Formosa," we had got ourselves into a fix "where our influence and prestige in East Asia depend upon an old man who presides over a feeble government which has been driven off the mainland."

A day or two later the Clarifier came up with the solution: neutralization of Formosa under a United Nations agency. "It would be a corollary of such a proposal that the bulk of the mainland Chinese in Formosa should be repatriated to the mainland and that Chiang and his lieutenants should be given asylum in some safe place"!

This cozy consignment of millions to Communist slavery was soon made ridiculous by the shellacking which the Red Chinese air raiders received from Chiang's air force at Quemoy. Among the first to reveal the extent of this rout was General Lawrence Kuter, who was US air commander in the Pacific. Apparently miffed by the intrusion of inconvenient facts, Lippmann took the general to task. He reminded General Kuter that "the bombardment can be renewed whenever the Communists are ready, and there is nothing that Chiang can do about it."

His basic objection to General Kuter's clarifying statement was that the General had "made it more difficult for this government to do what it is trying to do in the offshore islands. What the government is trying to do is to obtain a cease-fire after which, our being no longer at the point of a gun, we can bring about a disengagement at Quemoy." General Kuter's offense was that he had crabbed the act by suggesting that the Communists weren't as invincible as advertised, thereby causing people to suspect that we didn't have to "bring about a disengagement at Quemoy" after all.

GREETING WALTER LIPPMANN on his 70th birthday was a symposium of essays called *Walter Lippmann And His Times* (Harcourt, Brace). From this book, the work of journalistic colleagues, eggheads and a few grateful foreign savants, one can get the facts of Mr. Lippmann's life, his well-to-do-upbringing, his life in the intellectual inner circle at Harvard, his editorship of the *New Republic* and the New York *World,* his essays in semi-practical politics and his eventual establishment as clarifier of pseudo-liberal ideas to a putative conservative audience.

With such a background—especially the intimate association with James, Santayana, Barrett Wendell and the *cognoscenti* at Harvard before the heady days of Judge Charles Wyzanski and Ralph Bunche —one is hardly prepared for the Walter Lippmann of a half century after graduation. As "a child of the Enlightenment with a Gallic mind and a Gallic passion for reason and clarity" (Psychiatrist Carl Binger in the birthday book), Lippmann indulges in some curious special pleading.

Take Lippmann on the late John Foster Dulles. According to Lippmann, Dulles had at least three cardinal vices: he saw no reason why the United States should have any truck with the Communists; he didn't believe Communism had come to stay; he had a dispassionate lawyer's way of handling those who wanted to "disengage" from any place the Communists happened to be attacking. To Lippmann, Dulles' lack of interest in "negotiating" (the key word in Lippmannese) with the USSR was "tantamount to granting the Soviet government a monopoly on the issue of peace." In 1956 he charged Dulles with "saying that we hope for rebellion against and within the Soviet empire. This is to play with fire in a situation which is highly explosive!"

Obviously there had to be some explanation for the eccentricities of an American Secretary of State who considered it his duty to defend the honor and interests of his country. In May, 1958, Lippmann had the diagnosis: Dulles was tired! "Mr. Dulles himself is a marvel of endurance and intellectual vitality. But he conducts his office in a way which is plainly, as events are showing, beyond human power."

But Lippmann's anxiety was plainly less for Mr. Dulles' health than for the direction of his foreign policy. The crux of the argument was that President Eisenhower needed "his own adviser in foreign affairs." Of course, the idea was not to displace Dulles, but only "to relieve him of an impossible burden." The reform would "return to the White House its necessary authority" over foreign affairs and give Dulles "time and freedom to ponder the great issues." With Dulles pondering in a splendidly isolated State Department and Chiang Kai-shek pondering in "some safe place" away from Formosa, "negotiation" might get somewhere.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

For a man who has had so much influence on people, Lippmann takes an extremely dim view of their opinions. "Anyone can take a fling at poor old Mr. Rockefeller," he once wrote, "but the great mass of average citizens [to which none of us belongs] must be left in undisturbed possession of its prejudices." Some means should be devised to let experts do the governing.

"The perfectly sound ideal," he wrote in "Public Opinion," is "an executive who sits before a flat-top desk, one sheet of typewritten paper before him, and decides on matters of policy presented in a form ready for his rejection or approval." That is partly why McCarthy upset Lippmann so unreasonably. He didn't agree that the departmental experts could invariably be trusted to put the whole truth on that "one sheet of typewritten paper."

Therefore to Lippmann "McCarthyism is an invasion of the prerogatives of other branches of the government, particularly the executive branch." At Fort Monmouth, the Senate "was not investigating anything that was its business" to investigate. If the Executive couldn't find any Communists there—and Lippmann assured his readers there were none—then, we assume, Congress should lay off.

This enthusiasm for a powerful Executive and no nonsense from Congress has produced some curious explosions. During the 1954 hearings before the Senate Judiciary Committee on the nomination of Earl Warren to be Chief Justice of the United States, Senator William Langer, who was chairman of the committee, asked questions which suggested that as Governor of California the nominee had been tolerant of gambling interests.

"This," wrote Lippmann, "is an intolerable outrage. It violates the first principles of our law . . . It does not mitigate the horror of Senator Langer's offense that in fact Earl Warren is unscathed because his character is invulnerable. The offense is against the American people far more than it is against Earl Warren. This lawlessness on the part of a Senator is a threat against the power of the law to protect the liberties of our people."

This outburst seems to suggest that, should a man whose character is less invulnerable than Earl Warren's be nominated to the Supreme Court, it would be an offense against the American people for a Senator to seek the facts. But Lippmann himself has often complained of the paucity of information upon which the people are supposed to make important decisions at the polls or in their private attitudes. He bemoans the ignorance of the ordinary citizen, who "does not know what is happening, why it is happening, what ought to happen" and who "lives in a world which he cannot see, does not understand and is unable to direct." But when a Dulles or a Langer or a Gen. Kuter gives the benighted citizen something to bite on, Lippmann acts as if somebody had been caught planting an infernal machine under the Metropolitan Club.

YEARS AGO, IN 1916, Lippmann described a congressional committee room as a mean, smelly place, "so like the corridor of a cheap hotel" where one is tempted to "relax and grow bored and cease to care." Say for the congressional committees of 40 years later that they no longer bore Walter Lippmann! Instead they give him intense pain, presumably because the way a congressional committee gets information seems disorderly to the kind of man who expects the most confusing and inconsistent fragments of human activity to fit together like a jig-saw puzzle.

That is the other side of Lippmann, the determination to thrust conflicting and chaotic events into a pattern of rationality. Thus Eisenhower's first election, which was a revolt against the abuses of the Truman regime and would have been impossible without the cooperation of the conservative Republicans, was to Lippmann a considered decision by the Republicans to repudiate "the old bureaucracy of the party in the national committee and in the southern states . . . . It is a mandate for him [Eisenhower] to reorganize the Republican party for the times we live in" and to "give up trying to undo and reverse the history of the past twenty years."

The President himself appeared to believe something of the sort for a few months after his 1956 triumph, but the rise in his popularity began with the liquidation of Sherman Adams and Eisenhower's turn to the right. Today one hears little about "modern Republicans" or the effort to rebuild the GOP in the image of the party it has twice defeated. Nixon is the odds-on favorite for the succession, and Charles Halleck and Everett Dirksen lead the party in Congress. And, contrary to those who think "the times we live in" demand a constant veering to the left, the Republican Party's conservatism constitutes its best chance to remain in power.

Much of the criticism of Walter Lippmann is unfair. He doesn't "write like a well-informed corpse"; he is an unusually effective polemicist. He isn't really a "left-winger"; on domestic issues he is as often for the bosses as for the workers, provided everything goes like clock work and there is

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

no unseemly loud talk. I was about to go on and accept the verdict of most of the contributors to his birthday book that Lippmann represents the triumph of reason over emotion, of mind over muscle. His pieces dealing with the visit of Chairman (dear me, not Dictator) Khrushchev were on the reason level. To assume that Khrushchev had anything to do with the threats to Laos, "as some weird theorizers have suggested," was gauche and inept. Reason demanded negotiation of our position in Berlin and the Far East. Lippmann has praised national leaders who "have stood apart, who refused to be anxious or too much concerned, who were cool and inquiring and had their eyes on a longer past and a longer future. By their example they can remind us that the passing moment is only a moment; by their loyalty they will have cherished those things which only the disinterested mind can use."

Such men, I should think, would stand apart when the pack was tearing into Dulles as a reckless warmonger. Perhaps such men might fix their eyes on a future sufficiently distant to cause them to suspect that communism is too idiotic, tyrannical and economically dissolute to last long. And, since "the passing moment is only a moment," the "disinterested mind" won't waste too many moments in describing a candidate for Chief Justice as perfect until the man has had a chance to get into his robes and dash off a few opinions. Surely a disinterested mind won't attempt to convince an audience of bankers, clubwomen and, according to James Reston in the birthday book, Secretaries of State and members of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, that forcing the Chinese Nationalists out of Quemoy would strengthen the defense of Formosa.

Anyway, just when you are preparing to agree that Lippmann is Harvard Indifference to the Nth power and that his neutralism is explained by his fear that "moss-covered Error will moor him to its side as the world on Truth's current glides by," as the Harvard hymn has it; just when you are prepared to accept the picture of Lippmann as Mind Released from Emotion, you are thrown back to Lippmann, the passionate controversialist and to speculation on the greatest common factor of issues that arouse Walter Lippmann's ire.

It is all very well to treat Khrushchev and Mao Tse-tung with polished, tolerant reserve, but how does this comport with the outbursts of spleen against Chiang Kai-shek, Dr. Rhee, McCarthy, John Foster Dulles and poor neglected Senator Langer? The contempt shown Chiang and the pious patronizing of Dulles, not to mention the anger against MacArthur over the latter's efforts to win the Korean war, suggest something a little beyond the intellectual's distaste for men of action who prefer violence to negotiation. After all, Khrushchev's record of violence hardly qualifies him as the ideal companion in an evening with James, Royce and Santayana. And the late Mr. Dulles, who was an intellectual and a man skilled in negotiation, why wasn't he in the lodge? The late Secretary's intellect and diplomatic talents were employed in the effort to thwart the Communist conspiracy and to make the American people aware of their peril. That seems an inadequate reason for sneering at him and urging the President to appoint somebody to ride herd on him. The Clarifier should clarify.

What it comes down to is that the one obvious consistent pattern in the current global confusion is the one which Walter Lippmann refuses to recognize. The international Communist conspiracy is the single proven and increasingly evident consistency in a contradictory world. The existence of this conspiracy eludes Lippmann. "The theory that all Communist activity originates in the Kremlin is most improbable, and indeed it is more like paranoia than it is like politics," he wrote last September.

With many of Lippmann's own theories there can be wide agreement. Despite impressive evidence on the other side, advocacy of a strong Presidency and, *pari passu*, a flaccid Congress, has respectable sponsors. Also it is difficult not to share Lippmann's skepticism on the workings of "pure democracy" in time of crisis. But when a writer on public affairs seriously suggests that Mr. Khrushchev came here to get "some sort of modus vivendi about West Berlin *which he can persuade the East German Communist leaders to accept*" (Italics added), I confess I have had it. It's desirable to have public issues clarified, but to distill them into odorless invisible gas is carrying Enlightenment too far.

ORDER BLANK

HUMAN EVENTS, 408 First Street, SE, Washington 3, D. C.

Send me _____ reprints of "WALTER LIPPMANN: COMPLICATED 'CLARIFIER'" at $_____

[] Payment enclosed [] Bill me

Additional copies of this 4-page article: single copy 20c (coins not stamps); 10 copies $1; 25 copies $2; 100 copies $5; 500 copies $20; 1,000 copies $30. In 5,000 lots $25 per thousand. Unless otherwise ordered, reprints are sent by fourth-class mail, which takes ten days to two weeks for delivery. For first-class mail delivery of 4-page articles, add 1c per copy; for airmail, add 2c per copy.

Enter my subscription ☐ 5 weeks for $1 ☐ 1 year for $11

Name _____

Street _____

City _____ Zon _____ State _____

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED